DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 772 SP 039 300

AUTHOR Salzman, James A.
TITLE Talking the Same Language: Training Mentors To Use the Pathwise Performance Assessment with Induction-Year Colleagues.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Feedback; Higher Education; *Mentors; *Naturalistic Observation; *Performance Based Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This study examined the use of the Pathwise Performance Assessment as a framework for helping prospective mentors to view entry-year teachers' performance in accord with the research on novice teachers' performance. Participants were teachers, principals, and a central office administrator, most of whom had never conducted an observation of another teacher. The participants completed the Pathwise training then conducted an observation of another teacher using the framework. At the end of 3 weeks, they participated in a debriefing. At this time, they responded to an open-ended survey about their experiences conducting first-time observations using Pathwise in terms of their: (1) successes in their initial observation; (2) struggles in completing the observation; (3) perceived advantages and disadvantages to using Pathwise; and (4) concerns about mentoring. Respondents commented positively on the concreteness and clarity of the criteria in focusing their observations of entry-year teachers' teaching performances and minimizing observer bias. Major concerns included the amount of time and paperwork involved in doing an observation and anxiety over their own lack of expertise in applying these newly-learned skills. (Contains 29 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 772

Running head: SAME LANGUAGE

Talking the Same Language:

Training Mentors to use the Pathwise Performance Assessment with Induction-Year Colleagues

James A. Salzman

Greater Cleveland Educational Development Center (GCEDC)

Cleveland State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. A. Salzman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Presented at the American Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting, April 24 - 28, 2000, New Orleans, LA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP039280

Abstract

In the past 20 years, educators have paid increasing attention to the need for mentoring novice teachers within the context of the classroom. This has become a principal component of a number of both state-mandated initial certification programs and preservice teacher training programs. Some of this concern can be traced to the stressful nature of teaching which leads to nearly 50% of new teachers leaving education after teaching for seven years or less. In response, school districts nationwide are designing and delivering various forms of support for their new teachers. This study focused on the use of the Pathwise Performance Assessment as a framework for helping prospective mentors (N=27) to view entry-year teachers' (EYT) performance in accord with the research on novice teachers' performance. Participants responded to an open-ended survey upon engaging in their first observation after a two-day training. Respondents commented positively on the concreteness and clarity of the criteria in focusing their observations on EYTs' teaching performances and minimizing the observers' biases. Major concerns included the amount of time and paperwork involved in doing an observation, as well as anxiety over their own lack of expertise in applying these newly-learned skills.

Introduction

Over the majority of the past 6 years I had been teaching in a small, private liberal arts college. Part of my teaching responsibilities included teaching the first two courses, *Introduction to Education* and *Educational Psychology*, in the teacher preparation sequence. Students in these courses had a minimum of 20 field experience hours attached to each, and during these field hours they were expected to interview one or more teachers with whom they came in contact. Students wrote up the results of their interviews and we often used their conversations as ways of tying course content to the "real world" of teaching and teachers. In journal after journal, conversation after conversation, students would report that the classroom teachers with whom they came in contact would tell them that "that stuff you're learning in college is all well and good but you won't use it out here," or words to that effect. When I would probe my students further, a pattern appeared to emerge. They would often get that reaction when they would excitedly tell the classroom teachers about Maslow's hierarchy of needs or Vygotsky's zone of proximal development or Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and ask how the classroom teachers incorporate these into their instruction. At this point I suspected that many of these teachers were far enough away from these theories that, although they incorporated many theories every day of their teaching career, they did not want to be embarrassed by not knowing the precise terminology that the preservice students used. For the preservice teacher, however, because of their lack of experiential knowledge, this is the only language that they have. This lack of a common language to talk about teaching and learning is a barrier that hinders veteran and novice teachers alike in their efforts to improve their teaching to accelerate student learning.

Perspective

In the past 20 years, educators have paid increasing attention to the need for mentoring novice teachers within the context of the classroom. This has become a principal component of a number of both state-mandated initial certification programs and preservice teacher training programs (Huling-Austin, 1989a; Huling-Austin, 1989b). Some of this concern can be traced to the stressful nature of teaching which leads to nearly 50% of new teachers leaving education after teaching for seven years or less (Huling-Austin, 1989a). Given the increasingly complex nature of teaching and the demands for accountability by the many stakeholders of schools, including students, their parents, legislators, and business leaders, the stress is not likely to lessen for new teachers. In response, school districts nationwide are designing and delivering various forms of support for their new teachers. However, just because districts say they have a mentoring program in place does not mean that new teachers are provided with the support they need to become successful educators. In criticizing contemporary mentoring programs, Little (1990) stated that many provide assistance but not true mentoring, partially because the mentors do not fully understand their roles. Therefore, to deliver on the promise of mentoring programs, planners must facilitate novice mentors in understanding their roles by providing them with both the requisite knowledge, as well as practical experience, that can help them grow into the complexity required of "real" mentoring (Bey, 1990).

Providing Substantive Feedback for the New Teacher

Prior to their first jobs, the experiences of induction-year teachers will be as diverse as the individuals in terms of the support they have been provided. During the student teaching process, however, all of them will have had at least the support of two professionals: their cooperating teachers in the school and their university or college

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

supervisors. Though even the support here may be quite varied across states and even across and within specific programs, it is more than most new teachers will receive after they sign their first contract and are expected to live up to all of the expectations of a veteran teacher within the building. It is also highly likely that, given the busy-ness of the opening of school, they may not see another professional in their rooms until several weeks or months have passed. Under these circumstances, and with few experiences upon which to base their judgments, it is not surprising that new teachers may not know how they are doing.

In trying to fulfill this responsibility to new teachers, though, a second problem arises. Unless mentors develop the necessary skills and knowledge to provide new teachers with substantive feedback on how they are doing, a mentoring program may do more harm than good (Bendixen-Noe & Giebelhaus, 1997). The mentors, therefore, need to be provided with training and knowledge to understand both the function of mentoring and the process (Head, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1992). To do that, prospective mentors in this project took a two-step approach (Salzman, 1999). First, they were provided with a framework, the Pathwise Performance Assessment (Educational Testing Service, 1995), that identifies teaching behaviors of novices based upon a researched knowledge base (Dwyer, 1994). After training prospective mentors to use the Pathwise system, they were introduced to and worked on developing skills in cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1988; Costa & Garmston, 1994; D'Arcangelo & Wurzburg, 1988) that they could use to implement this framework with a protege. Both steps in the process were designed to assist mentors in their efforts to empower their proteges and promote reflective practice.

Reflection in the Practice of Teaching

While recent scholarly efforts have been devoted to inquiry into teachers as reflective practitioners, the consideration of reflection as a necessary component for expert teachers was certainly not new. As early as 1904, Dewey contended that, even in teacher preparation programs, teachers should be prepared for more than just initial practice and should become "thoughtful and alert students of education" (p. 15). Dewey later used the term *reflective thinking* "to mean bringing to mind and considering beliefs and knowledge about teaching" (Cruickshank, 1987, p. 4).

More recently, the term *reflective* had become popular in the literature, yet there was a lack of consensus on its usage (Stewart, 1994). For instance, Killion and Todnem (1991) defined reflection as "the practice or act of analyzing our actions, decisions, or products by focusing on our process of achieving them" (p. 15). Valverde (1982) defined it as "asking basic questions of oneself. The basic and comprehensive question during reflection is, What am I doing and why?" (p.86). Other manifestations of reflection have touted teachers as inquiry-oriented (Tom, 1985), radical pedagogues (Giroux, 1983), and critical re-theorizers (Parker, 1988).

Of all the definitions, though, two models seemed to reflect the polar ends of the major paradigms by which the concept of reflection was being taught in colleges at present. Cruickshank (1987) implored teachers to become students of teaching. He contended that those teachers who "study teaching deliberately and become students of teaching can develop life-long assurance that they know what they are doing, why they are doing it, and what will happen as a result of what they do" (p. 34). To become a student of teaching, Cruickshank developed a series of Reflective Teaching Lessons (RTLs). By preparing a lesson that was taught to peers, teaching the lesson, testing students on their development of the behaviors or skills, then processing with the peer group the experience in which the student had just engaged, students were taught to reflect on the act of teaching. It was in the last stage that students were considered to be exemplifying Schon's (1987) concept of reflecting on action.

While espousing his own view of the efficacy of RTLs, Cruickshank recognized that it was not as important the method that was chosen as the results of promoting reflection. He encouraged that teachers be presented with experiences which first engaged them "with reality (or a model of reality) and, second, cause[d] them to reflect on what happened--that is, to bring to mind for consideration" (p. 9).

A second model was provided by Zeichner and Liston (1987), who specified certain dispositions and types of thinking intended to facilitate the development of a reflective stance. This model represented the other end of the continuum from Cruickshank by dealing with "general discussions of the use of particular strategies such as ethnography, action research, or student teaching seminars without discussion of the specific ways in which the strategies are to be used" (Zeichner, 1988, p. 567). The use of such strategies is based on the assumption that these methods will prepare teachers to be more sensitive to the implications of the teaching-learning act within the contexts of the structures of schools. Ethnographic methods, for instance, were intended to problematize the "common sense" perceptions and assumptions which preservice teachers may bring to schools with them. Through this act, teachers would be helped to envision alternatives to the realities of schools as the teachers found them.

Gore (1987) tended to embrace Zeichner's model and criticized Cruickshank on the basis of his undergirdings in "technocratic rationality." While recognizing that the latter's methods were both viable and efficacious, she was concerned about his restricting of "the focus of reflection to means, that is, methods for achieving prespecified goals, and in so doing, [this] risks these means becoming ends in themselves" (p. 33). She also contended that the Zeichner model was more robust and in line with the Deweyan philosophy of reflectivity.

Somewhere between these endposts of the continuum, however, and a position more germane to the present study, was another perspective which proposed "a conception of reflection based on deliberation and choice among competing versions of good teaching" (Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, & Riecken, 1990, p. 25). This conception of reflection cited the importance of feedback as a source of information which could be evaluated critically. The intent of such feedback was to bring fresh insights on the practices of teachers in order to facilitate the "teacher's viewing of his or her behavior as a causal factor in his or her professional development" (p. 26).

While there remained disagreement within the field on how best to promote reflection, the major proponents of reflective practice agreed that it can be promoted. Accepting the premise that professional practice required reflection and that teachers, as professional educators, must reflect on their theories, practices, and the implications of theory upon practice as matters of course, attention then turned to the question: Upon what does the teacher reflect? For new teachers, that question can begin to be addressed within the domains and criteria of teaching reflected in the Pathwise Performance Assessment framework.

Using Pathwise to Begin a Conversation on Teaching and Learning

Pathwise is a framework that delineates the characteristics of effective teaching into four domains: planning, creating a learning environment, teaching for student learning, and professionalism (see Figure 1). Each of these domains is further broken down into criteria that reflect the effective teaching research knowledge base as it applies to novices (Dwyer, 1994; Reynolds, 1992). As operationalized in Ohio, the training consists of two intensive all-day workshops in which teachers learn about the characteristics of the different criteria through readings, direct instruction, collaborative inquiry and general discussion. These activities are designed to assist teachers in constructing an accurate conception of each domain and identifying positive and negative exemplars of teacher and classroom behaviors that indicate a new teacher's skill level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

under the standards within each domain. In addition to building the knowledge base, over the course of the two days, teachers engage in numerous simulations, by following teachers' sample paper trails under planning and demonstrating professionalism, as well as simulating the observation experience by watching videotapes of lessons. During these videos, the prospective mentors practice gathering the evidence they will need to document their entry-year teachers' (EYT) adeptness at creating learning environments and teaching for student learning. They also practice writing summaries that accurately capture the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers' lessons and making suggestions that reflect these same strengths and areas of concern. In the process, the prospective mentors learn about the forms that PRAXIS III assessors will use as they evaluate new teachers for their initial professional licenses in Ohio beginning with the 2002-03 school year.

Considering the high stakes nature of the use of the PRAXIS III Performance Assessment instrument for new teachers in the state of Ohio, there has been scant research on the use of the Pathwise system in terms of its effects on participants, both mentors and proteges. This is especially surprising when one considers that approximately 12,000 teachers in the state have been trained in the use of Pathwise with the prospects that they may mentor an induction-year colleague (Newcomer, R. M., personal communication, March 31, 2000). One of the few research studies (Giebelhaus & Bowman, 1999) was done with preservice teachers in their student teaching semester. It employed a quasi-experimental design to analyze the differences between an experimental group of mentors (N=14) who had been trained within the Pathwise framework and a control group of mentors (N=15) who experienced a more traditional orientation (e.g., conferencing strategies, Cogan's clinical model, record keeping) to supervising student teachers. Student teachers were videotaped, and those videotapes were analyzed be two independent raters trained in the PRAXIS III Assessment framework. Interrater reliability was .95, the standard required by ETS for high-stakes assessment. Giebelhaus and Bowman concluded that "prospective teachers who have cooperating teachers trained using [the Pathwise] framework for discussion demonstrate more complete and effective planning, more effective classroom instruction, and greater reflectivity on practice than those whose cooperating teachers received only the orientation" (p. 4). These results provide some solace for those working with prospective teachers using the Pathwise framework as a tool; they do not, however, answer all of the questions. The current study was designed to add to this knowledge base as districts and schools continue to "fine tune" their induction-year programs' designs and implementation.

Methodology

Sample

Subjects were teachers, principals, and a central office administrator (N=27) from a suburban school district in Northeastern Ohio. At least 90% of respondents were classroom teachers; the great majority of them had reported that they had never observed another teacher engaging in teaching an instructional lesson in at least the past five years. Many reported that they were nervous about observing another teacher after the initial training. To encourage honest feedback and to maintain subjects' anonymity, no demographic data were gathered.

Procedure

After participants finished the Pathwise training mentioned previously, which was done on consecutive days, prospective mentors were given three weeks in which to do

an observation of another teacher using the framework. At the end of the three weeks, all subjects participated in a "debriefing," which brought them back together as a group to share the successes and concerns raised by their initial observation. The session reinforced evidence-gathering procedures and the documentation process, provided further practice in the writing of domain summaries and suggestions, and allowed teachers the opportunity to discuss the observation process with each other and a State-certified Pathwise trainer. The debriefing began with teachers responding in writing to a set of open-ended questions from which the data for this study were gathered.

Data Analysis

The five investigator-designed questions prompted participants to describe their experiences with their first-time observations using Pathwise in terms of their: 1) successes in their initial observation; 2) struggles in engaging in the observation; 3) perceived advantages in using Pathwise; 4) perceived disadvantages; and 5) concerns about mentoring (not necessarily limited to the use of Pathwise in the mentor-protege relationship). The researcher adapted Kvale's (1983) steps in phenomenological research in a three-step procedure: 1) allowing teachers to describe their responses in an open-ended manner, 2) investigating the "essence" of those responses, and 3) phenomonologically reducing the emerging phenomena into a set of coded data. The coded data were organized into and reported in frequency tables.

Objectives

This study employed a qualitative method, exploratory in nature, to determine the perceived effects on participants of training in the Pathwise Performance Assessment framework as they prepare to act as mentors for new teachers. Specifically, the objectives were to investigate prospective mentors':

1. perceptions of their successes and difficulties in using the assessment instrument in observing another teacher;
2. perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of using Pathwise as a framework for observing another teacher; and
3. general concerns about engaging in a mentoring relationship with an induction-year colleague.

Results

In reporting results, the first two subsections will present mentors' perceptions of the experience of observing another teacher using the Pathwise framework. The next two subsections will present their perceptions of the general usefulness in using the framework in working with an EYT. The final section presents their concerns regarding their relatively new role as mentors; this information was originally gathered to guide further professional development.

Mentors' Perceptions of Successes in Initial Observations

The prospective mentors identified several aspects of their initial observation with which they felt successful. though not all of these were directly related to the Pathwise framework, the majority were (see Table 1). Nearly half of respondents (N=13) indicated that they found success in being able to identify specific examples within the domains, a concern commonly expressed by participants in these two-day trainings. One participant indicated that "I felt that I was able to observe many things at once, objectively. That surprised me." Another stated that she found success in documenting "Domain B

[Creating a Learning Environment] and C [Teaching for Student Learning]. I felt I was able to gather more evidence than I thought I would. It was easier for me to summarize and give suggestions for B [Creating a Learning Environment] and C [Teaching for Student Learning] . . ."

30% of respondents (N=8) also indicated that use of the framework facilitated their abilities to identify positive aspects of the teacher that they observed. One participant wrote: "The fact that the teacher did a nice job made the note taking easier. I felt like seeing the whole class gave me so much more time than the 10-15 minute excerpts we saw on video [in the training sessions]." Echoing these sentiments, another said "It was so nice to have specific criteria to use when observing another teacher. Most of the lesson parts fit easily into each domain."

The previous comments related directly to novice mentors applying the framework to the observation cycle. The next two most frequent responses - that the forms provided a structure for collecting data (N=5) and that the training had increased observer confidence (N=5) - also related directly to specific skills or aspects of training. The other response, though, to which 5 participants agreed, had far less to do with the training and much more to do with the interactive nature of mentoring in general. Nearly 20% of respondents indicated the importance of the "human" aspects of the mentoring process. Respondents who noted this generally indicated that having a willing colleague who allowed them to observe was a relief or that working with another colleague while processing their observations increased their confidence.

Mentors' Perceptions of Difficulties in Initial Observations

Though mentors recognized their initial successes in engaging in their first observation, as with learning any new skill, the experience was not without its difficulties. The most common difficulty was the concern, in varying degrees, that many experienced in documenting appropriate evidence within the domains in general (see Table 2). 41% of respondents (N=11) identified this as an area in which they struggled. Of those 11, the great majority struggled most with identifying specific evidence for the criteria in domains B - Creating an Environment for Student Learning (N=7) and C - Teaching for Student Learning (N=8). Summarizing many of these concerns, one teacher noted that she struggled especially with documenting the C domain because "I found myself watching the lesson and then forgetting to record all that I wanted. It's so rare to observe someone else teach."

These difficulties appear to be related to the next two most common areas of difficulty: the use of focused scripting (N=7) and uncertainty regarding their own skill level (N=7). As one prospective mentor indicated: "It was difficult to listen, watch, and write down everything that was taking place in the classroom. It was somewhat difficult to know where to write each comment." One other teacher echoed these comments when stating that the biggest struggle was "thinking about the criteria while trying to take notes. I didn't have enough information before observing which added to my difficulty of deciding where [examples and evidence] belonged."

While over a quarter of respondents indicated their difficulty with focused scripting or uncertainty about their skill levels, an equal number (N=7) indicated that the major concern was the amount of paper work and/or time that was involved in trying to do a full observation. Most of these respondents indicated that there were just too many papers that the EYT needed to fill out or that it was very difficult to fit the time needed for an observation into an already packed day of teaching. One, however, noted another concern, which went back to those collegial impulses mentioned in the previous section when she noted she "felt very rushed to have the observation completed and did not feel I put my best into working with the person I observed."

Mentors' Perceptions of Advantages of Using Pathwise in Observing EYTs

Overwhelmingly, teachers commented positively on the concreteness and clarity of the criteria within the four domains (see Table 3). 67% of respondents (N=18) indicated that the framework is helpful in supporting mentors' efforts in focusing their observations. In voicing the concreteness aspect, one teacher stated: "The framework gives focus for observations and helped me to sort out overlapping concerns and prioritize them. Knowing ahead of time what specifically I needed to look for and be aware of made the task easier and the organization of events more logical for me." 48% of respondents (N=13) also indicated that using Pathwise as an observational tool compelled them to focus on the characteristics identified in the framework as they watched teachers' lessons. In the words of one teacher, the "framework requires you to have evidence which takes out any 'bias' you may have. It allows you to be objective [underline in original]." Another teacher, who also cited the objectivity, added: "It also helps the teachers being observed know what things they are doing well."

Mentors' Perceptions of Disadvantages of Using Pathwise in Observing EYTs

While the structure provided by the framework was cited positively, prospective mentors expressed several concerns (see Table 4). The major disadvantage in their opinions (N=13) was the amount of paperwork or time that it would take to engage an EYT in a full Pathwise observation. The other most significant concern (N=9) was about the mentors' abilities to document accurately their entry-year teachers' actions and words under the appropriate criteria. While recognizing this as a disadvantage, one respondent noted: "The only disadvantage I can see at this point is the unfamiliarity [I have] with the framework. Experience and practice will overcome this."

Though cited by only 22%, a potentially more significant concern of the disadvantage of the framework was its lack of comprehensiveness. Citing the self-report nature of a number of the items, especially in Domains A - Planning for Student Learning and D - Teacher Professionalism, one respondent noted that "It would be really easy to 'fool' an examiner/mentor. One could look really good on paper and at the observed lessons, but really not put much effort at other times."

Mentor Perceptions of General Concerns on Becoming a Mentor

There was no clearly most significant concern raised by prospective mentors about their future roles and responsibilities. Most concerns cited had more to do with the general expectations of being a mentor rather than concerns specific to the use of Pathwise and their training in the use of the instrument. One-third of respondents (N=9) indicated a concern about communicating with their EYTs in ways that would be effective in supporting their professional development and growth as a teacher. This view was summarized by one teacher who stated that, if the new teacher were struggling, she hoped she could "be an effective mentor without appearing overbearing or judgmental." While the majority of those who responded in this way felt similarly mild anxieties about the responsibility of mentoring another, one prospective mentor saw this as an opportunity: "I find the more contact I have with others in a teaching scene, the more I can learn and incorporate into my own strategies and procedures. I have learned something from every one of my 'supervision,' observation, and 'mentoring' experiences. I hope [EYTs], too, can learn from me."

As identified earlier in the disadvantages, other concerns revolved around the amount of time and the paperwork required for doing some of the work as practiced in the training sessions. There were also concerns about the mentors' need for increased skill in observing and documenting results in accordance with the framework (N=7). Of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

course, these are typical concerns of using any newly-learned system or skill and will likely fade with continued use of the framework. A significant concern of teachers, though, and one that could not be addressed by continued practice with Pathwise, was a general uncertainty about the expected roles and responsibilities of mentors in this particular school district (N=7). This view was summed up by one who said "There is so much uncertainty about what being a mentor would entail -- how I would spend my day, how I would help the mentees . . ." It is this concern that demonstrates the limitations of any framework for observing teachers in school situations.

Results appear to support the use of Pathwise as a framework for novice mentors as they enter discussions with entry-year teachers about teaching and learning. Using Pathwise as a basis for mentor-protege relationships, teachers from different "generations" can share a common language about teaching based on a framework that provides mentors and novice teachers alike with realistic expectations of beginning teacher performance standards. One caveat: as with any instrument, the Pathwise Performance Assessment is only as good as the person using it; therefore, continued development of the mentors' skills will probably be a necessary component of using Pathwise as a source of feedback within a mentoring relationship.

Educational Importance

When the author submitted the proposal of this paper to AERA, two of the reviewers were very supportive and recognized the possible significance of the questions being explored in this study. Both gave the proposal high marks and supported its inclusion. One reviewer, however, considered the proposal "weak" and stated that the paper "promotes ETS proprietary training product but offers very little insight into the actual features and benefits of the framework." The intent, however, was not to promote proprietary material but to put it to some scrutiny. That 12,000 teachers have been trained in this framework within the state of Ohio but little study has been done should be of concern. On average, it costs about $2,000 for the two-day training previously described for every 25 teachers. Because of some collaborative agreements between ETS and the state of Ohio, this is a relative bargain. In the past two years alone, the professional development center at which the author works has encumbered expenses of more than $50,000 for Pathwise trainings and supported the efforts of individual districts with thousands of dollars more. As any educational community looks at its use of limited professional development resources, there needs to be a justification of the expenses in terms of its impact on the work of teachers and principals in school settings.

This particular study provides some insight into the perceptions of newly-trained prospective mentors into the advantages and disadvantages of the Pathwise framework as a tool to use in mentoring new teachers. These insights can provide professional developers with information that they can use as they train prospective mentors to use one of the number of available frameworks, whether that be the work of Charlotte Danielson (1996), those being developed by INTASC, or any of a number of others. That said, the author believes that neither the research nor the educational communities should dismiss out of hand a framework that may serve a purpose in assisting teachers in new roles upon which they are being called to fill simply because it is proprietary in nature. Rather, it is our responsibility to put to the test the claims that are being made by those who would sell materials and programs to districts. The current study provides several areas of concern as well as a number of strengths of the Pathwise framework, at least for these two groups of mentor-trainees. It is possible that training mentors to use <u>any</u> framework is likely to improve their performance in supporting the growth of new teachers. That is an area to explore in future studies. Certainly, however, the use of a framework, like Pathwise, which is grounded in the effective teaching knowledge base is

better than the alternative: to allow mentors to work from a state of unarticulated and possibly mis-theoretical or atheortetical stances as they inculcate new teachers into the profession. At the very least, using Pathwise allows both mentor and protege a chance to share a common language as they discuss those events and activities characteristic of teachers in their classrooms.

In addition to the potentially parochial issue with which the author began this section, there is national concern about the licensing and/or certifying of teachers. While a number of states are working to increase requirements for entering the teaching field, one of the states that is being watched closely at present is Ohio. According to Rule 3301-24-04 of the Ohio Administrative Code for Teacher Education and Licensure Standards, all provisionally-licensed teachers in Ohio will soon be required to successfully complete an entry-year program prior to being issued their first professional license. According to the standards, this program will include "a formal program of support, including mentoring to foster professional growth of the individual" (p. 8). Because this standard will be in place beginning with the 2002-03 school year, districts have a certain sense of urgency, especially those who are only now beginning their planning to meet this new demand being placed upon them. They are determining the designs of their mentoring program, how they will select and identify mentors, and how mentors will be trained and supported, in addition to many other concerns. Guidelines are minimal, and the implementation of most decisions remain local concerns. Because education faculty in Ohio have been working on redesigning their own programs for the past two years, they are certainly more aware of the ramifications of these standards on new teachers and the districts that hire them. It is because of this knowledge that those in higher education can provide a valuable service to local school districts by helping them design mentoring programs that will be contextually-sensitive and meaningful for the teacher-mentors who must carry out the job of continuing to support the novice professionals that colleges of education are sending out of their teacher preparation programs. Under a shared system of understanding, like Pathwise, a dialogue between higher educators and school-based educators also has the potential of facilitating a conversation that can bridge the chasm that is sometimes felt by both partners. All efforts can then be focused on helping teachers to make as smooth a transition as is possible as they move from novice to experienced to expert teacher in their career-long development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Bendixen-Noe, M., & Giebelhaus, C. (1997). Mentoring: Help or hindrance? Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 10(4), 20-23.

Bey, T. M. (1990). A new knowledge base for an old practice. In T. M. Bey & C. T. Holmes (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers (pp. 51-73). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1988). Another set of eyes: Conferencing skills trainer's manual. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for Renaissance Schools. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1987). Reflective teaching: The preparation of students of teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Danielson, C. (1996). Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

D'Arcangelo, M. (Producer), & Wurzburg, G. (Director). (1988). Another set of eyes: Conference skills. [Videotape]. Available from Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relationship of theory to practice in education. In C. A. McMurray (Ed.), The third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part 1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dwyer, C. A. (1994). Development of the knowledge base for the PRAXIS III: Classroom Performance Assessments assessment criteria. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Educational Testing Service. (1995). Pathwise orientation guide. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Giebelhaus, C. R., & Bowman, C. (1999). Is it worth the effort? The impact of mentor teacher training.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gore, J. M. (1987). Reflecting on reflective teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(2), pp. 33-39.

Grimmett, P. P., MacKinnon, A. M., Erickson, G. L., & Riecken, T. J. (1994). Reflective practice in teacher education. In R. T. Clift, W. R. Houston, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs (pp. 20-38). New York: Teachers College Press.

Head, F. A., Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1992). The reality of mentoring: Complexity in its process and function. In T. M. Bey & C. T. Holmes (Eds.), Mentoring: Contemporary issues and principles (pp. 5-24). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989a). Beginning teacher assistance programs: An overview. In L. Huling-Austin, S. J. Odell, R. S. Kay, & R. A. Edelfelt (Eds.), Assisting the beginning teacher (pp. 3-18). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989b). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. In J. Reinhartz (Ed.), Teacher induction (pp. 13-33). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Killion, J. P., & Todnem, G. R. (1991). A process for personal theory building. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 14-16.

Kvale, S. (1983). The qualitative research interview: A phenomenological and a hermeneutical mode of understanding. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 14(2), 171-195.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (pp. 297-351).

Parker, R. P. (1988). Theories of writing instruction: Having them, using them, changing them. English Education, 20(1), pp. 18-40.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching?: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 62(1), 1-35.

Salzman, J. A. (1999). With a little help from my friends: A course designed for mentoring induction-year teachers. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12(4), 27-32.

Schon, D. (1987). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Stewart, L. (1994, February). Teacher beliefs and temperament types. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, FL.

Tom, A. R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(5), pp. 35-44.

Valverde, L. (1982). The self-evolving supervisor. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching (pp. 81-89). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Zeichner, K. M. (1988). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. International Journal of Educational Research, 11, 565-575.

Appendix A

Pathwise Teacher Performance Assessments

Domain A - Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning

1. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences.
2. Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate to the students.
3. Demonstrating an understanding between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future.
4. Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate to the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.
5. Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson.

Domain B - Creating an Environment for Student Learning

1. Creating a climate that promotes fairness.
2. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students.
3. Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student.
4. Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior.
5. Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible.

Domain C - Teaching for Student Learning

1. Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students.
2. Making content comprehensible to students.
3. Encouraging students to extend their thinking.
4. Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.
5. Using instructional time effectively.

Domain D - Teacher Professionalism

1. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met.
2. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy (being able to identify ways to help students who are struggling or to identify how your efforts are helping students to be successful).
3. Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.
4. Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning.

Appendix B

Table 1

Frequency of Responses for Mentor Perceptions of Successful Aspects of Initial Pathwise Observation

Response	Frequency	Pct.
Ability to identify examples within domain(s)	13	48%
Ability to find positive aspects of teaching episode related to framework	8	30%
Forms provided structure for collecting data	5	19%
Willing colleague had agreed to work with observer (peer or EYT)	5	19%
Preparation in Pathwise increased observer confidence	5	19%
Conferencing (pre- and/or post)	2	07%
Previous experience in observation increased observer confidence	1	04%
Familiarity with grade level	1	04%
No response/Off-topic response	1	04%

Note: Maximum number for any single response was 27. Because individual subjects may have provided multiple responses, sum of responses will not equal 27.

Table 2

Frequency of Responses for Mentor Perceptions of Aspects of Initial Pathwise Observation with which They Struggled

Response	Frequency	Pct.
Specific domains were difficult to document[1]	11	41%
Domain A - Planning for Instruction	2	07%
Domain B - Creating a Learning Environment	7	26%
Domain C - Teaching for Student Learning	8	30%
Domain D - Teacher Professionalism	1	04%
Difficulties in using focused scripting	7	26%
Amount of time/paperwork involved	7	26%
Uncertainty about observational skill level	7	26%
Writing summaries of teacher performance	5	19%
Concerns about inaccuracy in applying framework to performance	5	19%
Writing suggestions for teacher improvement	3	11%
Discussing results with EYT	1	04%

Note: Maximum number for any single response was 27. Because individual subjects may have provided multiple responses, sum of responses will not equal 27.

[1]Individual respondents may have identified more than one domain in which they had difficulty documenting teacher performance.

Table 3

Frequency of Responses for Mentor Perceptions of Advantages of Using Pathwise while Observing Teacher Performance

Response	Frequency	Pct.
Provide focus for observing	18	67%
Minimizes bias/Encourages objectivity	13	48%
Mentors and/or EYT's have shared expectations	5	19%
Profiles/Paper trail facilitate accountability	3	11%
Encourages reflection in mentors	3	11%
Style of "write-ups" assists with providing feedback to EYT	2	07%

Note: Maximum number for any single response was 27. Because individual subjects may have provided multiple responses, sum of responses will not equal 27.

Table 4

Frequency of Responses for Mentor Perceptions of Disadvantages of Using Pathwise while Observing Teacher Performance

Response	Frequency	Pct.
Amount of paperwork/time involved	13	48%
Lack of observer expertise and/or familiarity with framework	9	33%
Lack of comprehensiveness of framework	6	22%
Anxiety expressed by observed/Personality factors	3	11%
Instrument can be "taught to"	2	07%
Accurate placement of documented evidence	1	04%

Note: Maximum number for any single response was 27. Because individual subjects may have provided multiple responses, sum of responses will not equal 27.

Table 5

Frequency of Responses for Mentor Perceptions of General Concerns of Becoming a Mentor

Response	Frequency	Pct.
Communicating with EYT to support their growth	9	33%
Need for increased skill in Pathwise observation/process	7	26%
General uncertainty about mentoring	7	26%
Time/Setting/Paperwork	6	22%
Differences between mentor and EYT	2	07%
No Response/No concerns	2	07%
Need more experience in classroom for credibility	1	04%

Note: Maximum number for any single response was 27. Because individual subjects may have provided multiple responses, sum of responses will not equal 27.